



**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
 United States Patent and Trademark Office  
 Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
 Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/695,022	10/23/2000	Steven Z. Wu	M-8873 US	3060

7590 08/01/2002

Cameron Kerrigan  
 SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.  
 One Maritime Plaza,  
 Suite 300  
 San Francisco, CA 94111-3492

EXAMINER

PREBILIC, PAUL B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3738

DATE MAILED: 08/01/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/695,022	WU ET AL.
	Examiner Paul B. Prebilic	Art Unit 3738

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 and 21-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11 and 21-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                           | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) Z . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

Newly submitted claim 26 is directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:

The claimed stent is not a therapeutic releasing device as set forth in the original or elected claims and sets forth a multisection multivolume stent. Therefore, it is deemed to be unrelated and independent from the presently prosecuted invention.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claim 26 is withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

The Japanese language document filed with the May 10, 2002 information disclosure statement fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

***Specification***

The amendment filed May 10, 2002 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. Applicant failed to show where the changes to the specification and claims had original support as requested in the previous Office action. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new

matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material, which is not supported by the original disclosure, is as follows:

On page 4, line 3, the deletion of "portion of" appears to now indicate that the whole device is depicted. This changes the original meaning of the specification.

On page 6, line 4, the deletion of "rigid but resiliently flexible" changes the original description of the device such that it would not be understood in the same manner.

On page 8, line 21, on lines 4-5 of the insert, the changed language results in new matter with respect to the original disclosure.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter or explain their original support in the reply to this Office Action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-11 and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The newly added language "string-like" is not defined and lacks original support. Therefore, <sup>not</sup> only is its scope not originally defined, but it also apparently expands the original meaning of the specification.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-11 and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1-11 and 21-25, the phrase "string-like" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "or the like"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9, 11, 21, 22, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brown et al (WO 98/23228), or alternatively, under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al (WO 98/23228) alone. Brown et al anticipates the claim language where the filament portions are the active agents in carriers (23,25) of Brown and they are "string-like" to the extent this claim language can be given patentable weight; see the whole document, especially Figure 9. The active agent with

Art Unit: 3738

carrier (23,25) is considered to be a fiber to the extent required by the present claim language.

Alternatively, if one does not consider the active agent with carrier (23, 25) to be fibers, it is the Examiner's position that they are clearly suggestive thereof due to they cylindrical elongate structures. For this reason, Brown et al is considered to at least clearly obviate the presently claimed invention under this interpretation.

With regard to claim 6 specifically, it is noted that the limitation of exposing the body to a laser is a method limitations. For this reason, it is not afforded much patentable weight in that it is product-by-process limitation; see MPEP 2113, which is incorporated herein by reference there. In particular, if the product is not considered to be identical, it is considered to be at least substantially identical to the extent that is it clearly obvious thereover.

With regard to claim 8, it is noted that collagen, one of the agents of carriers, is a polymer of amino acids as are all proteins. For this reason, the claim language is fully met.

With regard to claim 11, the barrier as claimed is present by the top end of the groove, which converges into a slit. Therefore, the present claim is at least obvious in view of Brown et al, which clearly suggests it.

With regard to claim 22, Applicant is directed to see elements (114) of Figure 18.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al (WO 98/23228) in view of Fischell et al (US 5,722,984). Brown et al at least obviates the claim language as set forth above and fails to teach the use of a radioactive isotope

as claimed. Fischell et al, however, teaches that it was known to use radioactive isotopes in stent devices in order to reduce cell proliferation and restenosis; see the whole document, especially the abstract. Hence, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to use a radioactive isotope along with or in place of the active agents of Brown et al in order to reduce cell proliferation and restenosis as taught by Fischell et al.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al (WO 98/23228) alone. Brown at least renders obvious the claim language as set forth in the Section 102 rejection above, but Brown fails to disclose the use of an adhesive with the filaments as claimed. However, since Brown discloses using other elements therewith (see page 13) and since the use of adhesive provides not stated advantage or unexpected/unobvious result, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been *prima fascia* obvious to use an adhesive with or on the drug depot of Brown in order to better secure it to the stent body.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed May 10, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Brown fails to disclose a filament having a string-like structure. However, the Examiner asserts that it does because "string-like" is vague and indefinite such that it fails to define over Brown. For this reason, the Examiner reasons that the claims are at least clearly obvious over Brown.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Applicant's submission of an information disclosure statement under 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p) on May 10, 2002 prompted the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 609(B)(2)(i). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Applicant should specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure, including the claims (MPEP 714.02 and 2163.06). Due to the procedure outlined in MPEP 2163.06 for interpreting claims, it is noted that other art may be applicable under 35 USC 102 or 35 USC 103(a) once the aforementioned problem is corrected.

Applicant is respectfully requested to provide a list of all copending applications that set forth similar subject matter to the present claims. A copy of such copending claims is respectfully requested in response to this Office action.

Art Unit: 3738

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Prebilic whose telephone number is (703) 308-2905. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott, can be reached on (703) 308-2111. The fax phone number for this Technology Center is (703) 872-9301.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 3700 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.



Paul Prebilic  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3738